| 1 2 3 4 5 | ANGELA H. DOWS, ESQ. Nevada Bar No. 10339 adows@crdslaw.com CORY READE DOWS & SHAFER 1333 North Buffalo Drive, Suite 210 Las Vegas, Nevada 89128 Telephone: (702) 794-4411 Facsimile: (702) 794-4421 Attorney for Defendant Susan Cope | | | | | |
|-----------------------|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| 6 | UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | | | |
| 7 | DISTRICT OF NEVADA | | | | | |
| 8 | *** | | | | | |
| 9 10 | UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,) 2:15-cr-00266-APG-VCF-3 | | | | | |
| 11 12 13 | v. Plaintiff,) v. STIPULATION TO CONTINUE MOTIONS DEADLINE ONLY | | | | | |
| 14 | SUSAN COPE, Defendant. (Twelfth Request)) | | | | | |
| 15 16 | IT IS HEREBY STIPULATED by and between Jason M. Frierson, United States | | | | | |
| 17 | Attorney, as well as Jean N. Ripley, Assistant United States Attorney, Counsel for the United | | | | | |
| 18 | States of America; and Angela H. Dows, Esq., counsel for Defendant SUSAN COPE, that the | | | | | |
| 19 | pretrial motions and notices of defense deadline, currently set for November 28, 2022 be | | | | | |
| 20 | continued to December 2, 2022. | | | | | |
| 21 | This is the twelfth overall request for a continuance in this case, and the fifth overal | | | | | |
| 22 | request by instant counsel for Defendant SUSAN COPE. One or more prior requests by instan | | | | | |
| 23 | counsel were for a continuance of the motions/notices of defense deadline only. This Stipulation | | | | | |
| 24 25 | is entered into based upon the following: | | | | | |
| 26 | 1. In August of 2022, Defendant Susan Cope filed and later withdrew a motion fo | | | | | |
| 27 | determination of her mental competency, with the potential to re-raise said motion | | | | | |
| 28 | bettermine of her mental competency, what the potential to be ruise said motion | | | | | |

- depending upon the results of an evaluation of the client, if conferred. (*See* ECF No. 330.)
- 2. In October of 2022, defense counsel submitted file documents to the approved psychologist expert for review, without revealing the communications and/or basis for hiring the expert.
- 3. On November 15 and 16, 2022, the Defendant was evaluated by the psychologist, with several tests conducted.
- 4. The decision of whether to proceed to trial is that of the Defendant, which as asserted by Defense counsel require additional levels of conferring in this case due to one or more underlying medical conditions that exist with Defendant Susan Cope.
- 5. The instant stipulation does not request a continuance of calendar call and trial dates.
- 6. That counsel for Defendant has conferred with her client, who is out of custody and, moreover, does not object to the requested continuance.
- 7. That the additional time requested herein is not sought for purposes of delay, but merely to allow the parties sufficient time by which to investigate, research, respond and litigate any pretrial motions and/or defenses deemed necessary prior to trial.
- 8. The additional time requested by this stipulation does not request an extension of the time of trial. To the extent applicable, the period requested to continue the matter serves the ends of justice and outweighs the best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, specifically 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and (h)(7)(B).

Case 2:15-cr-00266-APG-VCF Document 334 Filed 11/29/22 Page 3 of 5

| | 9. | Purcuant to 18 II | S.C. 8 3161(h) | (7)(R)(i) and (ii) denial of the | nis request for | |
|----|--|---------------------------|-------------------|--|-----------------|--|
| 1 | | | | | | |
| 2 | continuance would result in a miscarriage of justice, as additional time is needed | | | | | |
| 3 | by which to effectively and thoroughly research and prepare for trial within the | | | | | |
| 4 | time limits established by 18 U.S.C. §3161, taking into account the exercise | | | | | |
| 5 | | due diligence. | | | | |
| 6 | 10. | For all the above-s | tated reasons, tl | he ends of justice would best | be served by a | |
| 7 | | | | | | |
| 8 | | | | | diffic. | |
| 9 | DATED this 28th day of November, 2022. | | | | | |
| 10 | JASON M. F United States | | | CORY READE DOWS & SH. By: /s/ Angela H. Dows | AFER | |
| 11 | By: /s/ Jean | N. Ripley | | ANGELA H. DOWS, ESQ. | | |
| 12 | JEAN N. RIP | PLEY ited States Attorney | | Appointed Counsel for Defendant Susan Cope | ant | |
| 13 | Counsel for Plaintiff | | | | | |
| 14 | | | | | | |
| 15 | | | | | | |
| 16 | | | | | | |
| 17 | | | | | | |
| 18 | | | | | | |
| 19 | | | | | | |
| 20 | | | | | | |
| 21 | | | | | | |
| 22 | | | | | | |
| 23 | | | | | | |
| 24 | | | | | | |
| 25 | | | | | | |
| 26 | | | | | | |
| 27 | | | | | | |
| 28 | | | | | | |

| UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| DISTRICT OF NEVADA | | | | | |
| | *** | | | | |
| UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, |)) | | | | |
| Plaintiff, |) 2:15-cr-00266-APG-VCF-3) | | | | |
| v. |)) FINDINGS OF FACT, | | | | |
| SUSAN COPE, |) <u>CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND</u>) <u>ORDER THEREON</u> | | | | |
| Defendant. | <u> </u> | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| <u>FINI</u> | DINGS OF FACT | | | | |
| Based on the pending Stipulation | of the parties, and good cause appearing therefore, the | | | | |
| Court finds that: | | | | | |
| Defense counsel requires a continuance of the motions and notices of defense | | | | | |
| deadline in order to review and research the case in light of recent issues that have arisen as to | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| Defendant Susan Cope's competency and/or mental health. | | | | | |
| 2. The parties also request additional time to effectively represent their clients in | | | | | |
| appropriately preparing the case for trial, and thus request an extension of the trial date and | | | | | |
| related calendar call date. | | | | | |
| 3. Defendant is out of custody, and does not object to the continuance. | | | | | |
| | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

- 1. The additional time requested by this stipulation does not extend the time of trial. The period was previously found excludable in computing the time within which the trial herein must commence pursuant to the Speedy Trial Act, specifically 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(A) and (h)(7)(B).
- 2. Denial of this request for continuance would result in a miscarriage of justice, as additional time is needed by which to review the case, in a case involving charges of Conspiracy to Distribute a Controlled Substance (Oxycodone) pursuant to 21 U.S.C. § 846.
- 3. Denial of this request for continuance would also deny the parties herein sufficient time and the opportunity within which to effectively and thoroughly research and prepare for trial within the time limits established by 18 U.S.C. §3161, taking into account the exercise of due diligence. For the above-stated reasons, the ends of justice would best be served by a continuance, and such continuance outweighs the best interests of the public and the defendants in a speedy trial.

ORDER

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED that the parties shall have to and including December 2, 2022 within which to file any and all pretrial motions and notices of defense.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: November <u>29</u>, 2022.

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE